

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 773

JC 910 301

AUTHOR Knight, William E.
TITLE Regional Campuses Non-Returning Student Survey.
INSTITUTION Kent State Univ., OH. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 90p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Research; *Dropouts; Followup Studies; Higher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; Stopouts; *Student Attitudes; *Student Educational Objectives; Student Personnel Services; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Kent State University OH Regional Campuses

ABSTRACT

In spring 1991, a study was conducted of non-returning students from the seven 2-year Regional Campuses (RC's) of Kent State University to identify demographic characteristics of such students, determine the reasons they did not continue their enrollment, and obtain their opinions regarding the academic and student services at the RC's. Of the 2,392 students who had enrolled in fall 1990 but who did not return in spring 1991, a random sample of 1,022 were surveyed. Study findings, based on a 20% response rate, included the following: (1) non-returning students shared many of the same demographic characteristics as past and current RC students; (2) 52% of the respondents reported cumulative grade point averages between 3.0 and 4.0, and 83% were employed; (3) 69% of the non-returning students had been enrolled part time, compared with 54% of all RC students; (4) from a list of 19 potential reasons, the ones cited most frequently for not returning were, in rank order, desired courses were not available, personal reasons, did not have enough money to continue, family responsibilities were too great, classes were scheduled at the wrong times, could not work and attend college simultaneously, and achieved academic goals; (5) most academic and student services were rated as moderate, high, or very high; (6) Veterans' Services, and Minority Student Services were rated least favorably; (7) 75% of the respondents said they had enrolled for only a limited number of courses for transfer or increased knowledge, or were unsure of their academic goals; and (8) 47% of the respondents planned to return to the RC's. Detailed data tables and the survey instrument are included. (PAA)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED332773

REGIONAL CAMPUSES NON-RETURNING STUDENT SURVEY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. E. Knight

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY REGIONAL CAMPUSES OFFICE OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION SERVICES

MAY 1991

William E. Knight

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 910301

ABSTRACT

TITLE: REGIONAL CAMPUSES NON-RETURNING STUDENT SURVEY

AUTHOR: William E. Knight, Coordinator, Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services, Regional Campuses

SUBJECT: A Study of the Kent Regional Campuses Fall 1990
Students Who Did Not Re-Enroll for Spring 1991

DATE: May, 1991

SOURCE OF COPIES: Kent State University Regional Campuses
Lincoln Building
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2330

DISTRIBUTION LIST: President
Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Vice Provost for Regional Campuses
Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Members, Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council
Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campuses
Director, School of Technology
Director of Two Year Technical Programs
Director of Business Affairs
Assistant Director of Business Affairs
Coordinator of Admissions and Records
Regional Campus Deans
Regional Campus Directors of Student Affairs
Regional Campus Admissions Officers

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 58

ABSTRACT: This study was undertaken to describe the characteristics of students who did not continue their enrollment, reasons why they did not continue, and their opinions of academic and student services.

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Contents	ii
List of Tables	iii
Executive Summary	v
I. STUDY DESCRIPTION	
A. Background	1
B. Objectives of the Study	1
C. Study Design	2
D. Sampling	2
E. Analyses	3
II. SURVEY RESULTS	
A. Part One-Characteristics of the Respondents	4
B. Part Two-Reasons Why Students Did Not Continue Their Enrollment	7
C. Part Three-Opinions of Academic and Student Services	9
D. Part Four-Open-Ended Comments	14
Tables	17
III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	47
IV. REFERENCES	51
IV. APPENDIX	
A. The Survey	52

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Ages of Respondents	17
Table 2 Campus Attended by Respondents	18
Table 3 Attendance Duration of Respondents	19
Table 4 Self-Reported Cumulative Grade Point Averages of Respondents	20
Table 5 Reason for Leaving by Campus	21
Table 6 Academic Advising by Campus	22
Table 7 Admissions by Campus	23
Table 8 Buildings and Grounds by Campus	24
Table 9 Career Placement by Campus	25
Table 10 Career Planning by Campus	26
Table 11 Computer Laboratories by Campus	27
Table 12 Faculty Attitude Toward Students by Campus	28
Table 13 Financial Aid by Campus	29
Table 14 Food Service by Campus	30
Table 15 Library Services by Campus	31

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table 16	Minority Student Services by Campus	32
Table 17	Parking by Campus	33
Table 18	Personal Counseling by Campus	34
Table 19	Quality of Instruction in All Courses by Campus	35
Table 20	Quality of Instruction in LER Courses by Campus	36
Table 21	Quality of Instruction in Major Courses by Campus	37
Table 22	Regional Campuses Concern for Students as People by Campus	38
Table 23	Registration by Campus	39
Table 24	Skills/Tutoring Center by Campus	40
Table 25	Student Activities by Campus	41
Table 26	Student Affairs Staff Attitude Toward Students by Campus	42
Table 27	Student Employment by Campus	43
Table 28	Veterans Services by Campus	44
Table 29	General Satisfaction with the KSU Regional Campuses by Campus	45
Table 30	Mean Satisfaction Ratings for Selected Campus Services by Campus	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The survey was conducted in the spring of 1991. It was undertaken to describe the characteristics of Regional Campuses students who did not continue their enrollment, reasons why they did not continue, and their opinions of the academic and student services provided.

The sample consisted of one-half of the 2,392 (1,196) students who were enrolled during the fall semester of 1990 but who did not return for the spring semester of 1991. A 20% final response rate was obtained. The respondents were generally representative of all Regional Campuses students with respect to gender, ethnicity, age, full-time/part-time status, and campus attended.

The three objectives of the survey and the results are as follows:

1. To gain information concerning the characteristics of Regional Campuses new students who did not re-enroll

They shared many of the same characteristics as past and current Regional Campuses students; 76% of the respondents were female; nearly all identified themselves as Caucasian; there was a wide age distribution of respondents and the largest number were in the 31-40 age range. The percentages of respondents attending each campus generally reflected the percentages of all new freshmen students attending each campus, although East Liverpool was under-represented and Geauga was over-represented. This should be remembered when interpreting the results.

Sixty percent of the respondents had been enrolled one semester or one year. More than one-half of the respondents reported their grade point averages as between 3.00 and 4.00. Over 80% of the respondents were employed. The Kent State University Regional Campuses were the first enrollment choice of 73% of the respondents.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were enrolled primarily part-time, in contrast to about 54% of all students enrolled part-time. Forty-three percent of the respondents were working towards a baccalaureate degree while enrolled and 39% toward an associate degree. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were freshmen or sophomores. Forty-nine percent of the respondents have taken one or more developmental education courses.

Most of the respondents reported 1) completing courses for transfer to the Kent Campus or to another educational institution, completing some courses to increase their knowledge and understanding in an academic field, or obtaining an associate degree as their most important academic goals, 2) improving knowledge, technical skills, and competencies in a current career or preparing for a new career as their most important career goals, 3) meeting people as their most important social goal, and 4) developing the ability to be independent, self-reliant, and adaptable as their most important personal development goal.

Forty-seven percent of the respondents say they will return to the Regional Campuses and 41% say they have transferred or will transfer to another institution.

2. To ascertain some of the reasons why students did not continue their enrollment

The reasons most frequently chosen as important for not returning from a list of 19 potential reasons included, in rank order, desired courses not being available, personal reasons, family responsibilities, not having enough money to continue, not being able to work and attend college simultaneously, classes being scheduled at the wrong times, achieving academic goals, needing a break from college, not being able to obtain financial aid, desired programs not available, transfer to another institution, accepting a job, respondents dissatisfaction with their academic performance, and dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching.

The most frequent reasons for leaving gathered from the open-ended responses were, in rank order, the availability of courses, accepting a job, and not being able to afford to continue. A more critical reading of the availability of courses response revealed respondents were actually addressing three issues; 1) they had completed the courses required for an associate degree, but would graduate in a subsequent semester, 2) they desired upper division courses not available at their campus, and 3) they desired courses not offered by the campuses.

3. To learn respondents' opinions regarding the academic and student services provided

The respondents rated from very high to very low their agreement with a number of statements concerning the image of the Regional Campuses and their satisfaction with each of the 24 academic and student services listed. Most of the responses were in the high, very high, and moderate categories.

Conclusions

Many of Tinto's (1987) reasons for why college students, particularly those in two-year institutions, do not return were confirmed by this study. Many of the reasons were either positive outcomes (such as transfer or achievement of academic goals) or factors over which the University has no direct control (career and family responsibilities and personal reasons). Evidence suggests lack of financial resources may not be as relevant a reason as it appears. More than 75% of the respondents plan to re-enroll within the Regional Campuses or were unsure of their future plans; this information may provide for a more sophisticated and comprehensive view of student attrition and enrollment behaviors.

I. STUDY DESCRIPTION

A. Background

This study was undertaken by the Regional Campuses Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services to learn more about why students do not continue their enrollment at the Regional Campuses. A system emphasis upon access to educational opportunities and the March 1991 visit to a Regional Campuses retention workshop by Dr. Vincent Tinto, professor at Syracuse University and noted expert on college student retention, provided an important background to the study.

This document represents a detailed analysis of the responses of students who were enrolled during the fall of 1990 but who did not return for the spring of 1991 to the Non-Returning Student Survey. The purpose of the survey was to develop a framework for analysis that would assist the Regional Campuses in improving enrollment management decision making and in improving academic and student services for future students. While surveys have been conducted in the past at certain campuses in response to specific information needs, this was the first attempt to present non-returning student information in a comprehensive way on an overall Regional Campuses system level. This study was, therefore, additionally designed to serve as a benchmark for comparison purposes with the August 1990 Regional Campuses Alumni Survey, the December 1990 New Freshmen Survey, and with future studies.

B. Objectives of the Study

This study sought to meet the following three objectives:

To gain information concerning the characteristics of students who did not re-enroll

To ascertain some of the reasons for students' decisions not to re-to enroll

To learn the opinions of academic and student services of students who did not re-enroll

C. Study Design

In order to address the objectives outlined above, a multi-stage survey design process was developed. First, existing two-year and four-year non-returning survey instruments (commercially available and from other institutions) were reviewed. Then the Kent Campus Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services was consulted. Third, a draft survey was reviewed by the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses, Dean for Academic Affairs, Regional Campus Deans, members of the Information Officers Advisory Group, and by Dr. Tinto. The survey was modified as a result of the comments of these reviewers. Fourth, the survey was pilot tested by a group of students. A computer scannable answer sheet was included with the final version of the survey, allowing for more efficient analysis of results. Unlike previous surveys carried out by the office, this survey was anonymous and also was accompanied by a personalized cover letter. An enclosure including open-ended questions was also developed, whereby respondents listed their major, other colleges serving as first enrollment choices, reasons for these choices, institutions to which they may have transferred, and any additional comments concerning why they did not continue their enrollment.

D. Sampling

A comparison of the Fall 1990 and Spring 1991 student databases revealed that 2,392 students did not continue their enrollment. A random sample of one-half (1,196) of these students was selected and students who had relocated to the Kent Campus (116 or 9.7%) or had been academically dismissed from the University (55 or 4.6%) were removed from the sample. Surveys were mailed to the remaining 1,022 students. Twenty-one surveys were returned as undeliverable. One hundred ninety-eight of the remaining 1,001 surveys were returned, providing a 20% response rate. While this response rate was lower than that for other surveys conducted by the office, which is difficult to understand considering the provision of anonymity and of a personalized cover letter, it does compare favorably with the 18% response rate of a concurrent survey undertaken by the Kent Campus office and should still yield results worthy of consideration.

E. Analyses

Results of the survey were analyzed by determining the distribution of answers among all respondents. Responses to demographic items were compared to the analogous information for all Regional Campus Fall 1990 students in order to determine if the survey responses were truly representative. Several responses were analyzed by campus. Open-ended responses were analyzed by searching for common responses and noting the frequencies of these comments. Survey results are presented in Section II.

II. SURVEY RESULTS

A. Characteristics of the Respondents

Seventy-six percent of the survey respondents were female and 24% were male. This does not differ substantially from the current gender profile of Regional Campus students; during 1990-1991 63% were female and 37% were male.

The vast majority of the respondents (93%) identified themselves as Caucasian. The remainder of the respondents identified themselves as Native American (4%), African American (1%), Asian American (1%), or other (1%). Again this does not differ significantly from the current or recent ethnic profiles of Regional Campuses students; during 1990-1991 the ethnic profile for all new freshmen showed 98% as caucasian and 2% African American, with less than 1% Asian American, Hispanic, or Native American.

As Table 1 indicates, there was some distribution of responses among the age categories. Large numbers of respondents reported being in the 31-40 age range (32%) with smaller numbers in the 18-21 age range (19%), the 41-50 age range (17%), the 22-25 range (15%), the 26-53 range (14%) and the 51 to 60 ranges (3%). This distribution of age ranges for respondents is similar to that for all students.

As Table 2 shows, a good mixture of responses was received from respondents from each of the campuses. The percentage of respondents from each campus was roughly similar to the percentage of all students attending each of the campuses, although East Liverpool was under-represented and Geauga was over-represented.

The largest percentage of respondents (36%) indicated they had attended only one semester before they stopped attending. Twenty-four percent attended for one year, 14% for two years, 15% for three years, and 11% for three or more years. This information is presented in Table 3.

Fifty-two percent of the respondents said their cumulative grade point average was between 3.00 and 4.00. Thirty-three percent said their grade point average was between 2.00 and 3.00. Of the remaining 15%, 9% were not sure of their grade point average, 5% said their grade point average was between 1.00 and 1.99, and 1% said their grade point average was below 1.00, as seen in Table 4. The actual grade point averages of all students who did not return for the Spring 1991 semester were available for comparison purposes. Thirty-one percent had grade point averages between 3.00 and 4.00; 46% between 2.00 and 3.00, 20% 1.00 to 2.00, and 3% less than 1.00.

Eighty-three percent of the respondents indicated they were employed, 33% for 40 hours per week, 22% each for 20 to 39 hours per week and more than 40 hours per week, and 6% for fewer than 20 hours per week. Of the remaining 17%, 13% were unemployed by their own choice or due to family responsibilities and 4% were seeking employment. This matches the 80% student employment rate found in previous studies.

Seventy-three percent of the total respondents reported that the Regional Campuses were their first choice when they considered colleges in which to enroll. This is similar to the 63% of respondents to the 1990 New Freshmen Survey who indicated the Regional Campuses were their first choice.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents said they had primarily been enrolled part-time and 31% said they had been enrolled full-time.

The largest percentage the respondents (43%) indicated that they were currently working toward a bachelor's degree. Thirty-nine percent reported they were currently working toward an associate degree. Thirteen percent of the respondents were not seeking a degree, 3% were attending for re-certification, and 2% were working toward a graduate degree.

Forty-two percent of the respondents were freshmen, 23% were sophomores, 14% were juniors, 7% were seniors, 6% were graduate students, and 8% indicated no class level.

The largest percentage of the respondents (33%) said that their most important academic goal was completing courses for transfer to the Kent Campus or to another educational institution. Completing the courses necessary to increase knowledge and understanding in an academic field was the second most frequent response (28%). Obtaining an associate degree was the third most frequently cited response at 24%. Fifteen percent listed their most important academic goal as other or unsure.

Improving knowledge, technical skills, or competencies in the current career and preparing for a new career were the most frequently cited important career preparation goals at 35% and 34% respectively. Twelve percent of the respondents indicated exploring new career interests was their most important career preparation goal. Increasing the chances for a raise or promotion was listed as the most important career goal by 10% of the respondents. Nine percent were unsure of their career preparation goals.

The greatest percentage of the respondents (75%) had no social or cultural participation goal in mind or were unsure. To meet new people was the most frequently cited social or cultural participation goal at 16%. Getting to know people who think and feel differently than they do was listed as the most important goal by 6% and becoming actively involved in campus life and activities was most important for 3%.

To develop the ability to be independent, self-reliant, and adaptable was listed as the most important personal development and enrichment goal by 35% of the respondents. To learn skills that will enrich their lives or make them more complete people was the most important goal for 24%. Twenty percent had no personal development goal in mind. To increase self-confidence was listed by 14% of the respondents. Improving leadership skills was listed by 6% and to improve the ability to get along with others was listed by 1%.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents said they plan to return to college; 47% will re-enroll at the Regional Campuses, 30% have enrolled at another college, and 11% plan to enroll at another college. Eight percent will not return to college and 4% are unsure. There was a substantial difference at East Liverpool, where 83% of respondents said they intend to return to the campus.

Forty-two percent of the respondents completed no developmental education courses; 20% completed one; 15% completed three or more and; 14% completed two.

B. Reasons Why Students Did Not Re-Enroll

Nineteen possible reasons why students did not re-enroll were listed and respondents were asked to rate the importance of each reason for them. Thirteen of these reasons were listed by more than ten percent of the respondents as very important or important and are listed below.

Courses I wanted were not available	25%
Personal reasons	25%
Did not have enough money to continue	23%
Family responsibilities were too great	23%
Classes were scheduled at the wrong times	22%
Could not work and go to school at the same time	22%
Achieved my academic goals	21%
Needed a break from college	19%
Could not obtain sufficient financial aid	18%
Programs I wanted were not available	18%
Transferred to another college	14%
Accepted a job	13%
Dissatisfied with my academic performance	11%
Dissatisfied with the quality of teaching	11%

Responses were also analyzed in order to determine any significant relationships between reasons for not re-enrolling and several student characteristics (gender, age, campus attended, grade point average, intention to return, and number of developmental education courses completed).

Twenty-two percent of women, as contrasted to 11% of men cited the unavailability of financial aid as a very important or important reason why they did not return. Thirty-nine percent of men, but only 17% of women cited not being able to work and attend college at the same time as a very important or important reason.

Not having enough money to continue was a very important or important reason for 48% of those age 18 to 21 compared to 23% overall. Not receiving financial aid was a very important or important reason for 43% of the 18 to 21 age group, while very important or important for 18% of all respondents. Twenty-three percent of the 22 to 25 age group listed accepting a job as a very important or important reason for not returning, as contrasted to 13% for all respondents.

Desired programs not being available was a very important or important reason for not returning for 33% of East Liverpool students, while 18% overall. Only 9% of students from Salem cited not having enough money to continue as a very important or important reason as opposed to 23% overall. Accepting a job was a very important or important reason for not returning for 14% and 25%, respectively, of students from Salem and Trumbull as compared to 13% for all respondents. Mean ratings of the importance of reasons for leaving are shown by campus in Table 5.

Not being able to afford to continue was a very important or important reason for 55% and 40%, respectively, of students who reported their grade point average as between 1.00 and 2.00 or who were not sure of their grade point averages, as opposed to about 21% for those with higher self-reported grades.

Achieving their academic goals was a very important or important reason for 59% of those who said they will not return to college compared to 21% for all respondents. Classes being scheduled at the wrong times was a very important or important reason for 36% of those who have transferred to another college while very important or important to 22% of all respondents. Accepting a job was very important or important as a reason for not returning for 28% of those who were unsure if they would return and very important or important to 13% overall.

C. Opinions of Academic and Student Services

The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with 24 academic and student services and other characteristics of the Regional Campuses. The results are as follows:

Academic Advising	10%	Very High
	23%	High
	23%	Moderate
	9%	Low
	7%	Very Low
	28%	Did Not Respond
Admissions	20%	Very High
	38%	High
	32%	Moderate
	3%	Low
	3%	Very Low
	4%	Did Not Respond
Buildings and Grounds	18%	Very High
	36%	High
	23%	Moderate
	2%	Low
	1%	Very Low
	20%	Did Not Respond
Career Placement	2%	Very High
	4%	High
	9%	Moderate
	1%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	82%	Did Not Respond
Career Planning	2%	Very High
	8%	High
	11%	Moderate
	4%	Low
	6%	Very Low
	69%	Did Not Respond

Computer Laboratories	11%	Very High
	19%	High
	18%	Moderate
	2%	Low
	1%	Very Low
	49%	Did Not Respond

Faculty Attitude Towards Students	21%	Very High
	39%	High
	23%	Moderate
	6%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	9%	Did Not Respond

Financial Aid	12%	Very High
	14%	High
	11%	Moderate
	5%	Low
	4%	Very Low
	54%	Did Not Respond

Food Service	7%	Very High
	24%	High
	35%	Moderate
	7%	Low
	3%	Very Low
	24%	Did Not Respond

Library Services	15%	Very High
	25%	High
	22%	Moderate
	6%	Low
	1%	Very Low
	31%	Did Not Respond

Minority Student Services	2%	Very High
	3%	High
	9%	Moderate
	2%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	82%	Did Not Respond

Parking	21%	Very High
	23%	High
	31%	Moderate
	9%	Low
	6%	Very Low
	10%	Did Not Respond

Personal Counseling	5%	Very High
	11%	High
	11%	Moderate
	5%	Low
	4%	Very Low
	64%	Did Not Respond

Quality of Instruction in LER Courses	10%	Very High
	23%	High
	26%	Moderate
	1%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	38%	Did Not Respond

Quality of Instruction in Your Major	19%	Very High
	27%	High
	21%	Moderate
	6%	Low
	5%	Very Low
	22%	Did Not Respond

Overall Quality of Instruction	16%	Very High
	36%	High
	28%	Moderate
	3%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	15%	Did Not Respond

Regional Campuses'
Concern for You as a
Person

14% Very High
19% High
33% Moderate
7% Low
3% Very Low
24% Did Not Respond

Registration

20% Very High
36% High
28% Moderate
8% Low
4% Very Low
4% Did Not Respond

Skills/Tutoring Center

8% Very High
12% High
13% Moderate
4% Low
2% Very Low
61% Did Not Respond

Student Activities

4% Very High
9% High
11% Moderate
3% Low
1% Very Low
72% Did Not Respond

Student Affairs Staff

Attitude Towards Students 5% Very High
15% High
20% Moderate
2% Low
3% Very Low
55% Did Not Respond

Student Employment	4%	Very High
	4%	High
	14%	Moderate
	2%	Low
	2%	Very low
	74%	Did Not Respond
Veterans Services	2%	Very High
	4%	High
	8%	Moderate
	2%	Low
	2%	Very Low
	82%	Did Not Respond
General Satisfaction with the Regional Campuses	20%	Very High
	39%	High
	28%	Moderate
	4%	Low
	1%	Very Low
	8%	Did Not Respond

This information is further presented by campus in **Table 6 through Table 29**. The mean score for each of these services on the 1 (very low) through five (very high) scale is presented by campus in **Table 30**.

D. Open-Ended Comments

The respondents were requested on a supplemental answer sheet to list their major, other colleges serving as first enrollment choices, reasons for these choices, institutions to which they may have transferred, and any additional comments concerning why they did not continue their enrollment. These data were analyzed by searching for common responses and noting their frequencies. Responses which appeared more than twice are listed below for each of these five topics and are listed by decreasing frequency.

Students' Majors

Pre-business/Business Management Technology	34
None/Undecided	25
Nursing (AD or BD)	16
Accounting Technology	15
Elementary Education	10
Computer Technology	7
Office Technology	5
Psychology	5
Systems/Industrial Engineering Technology	5
Education (unspecified)	4
Mechanical Engineering Technology	4
Physical Therapy Assistant Technology	4
General Studies (AD or BD)	3
Human Services Technology	3
Art	2
Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology	2

Other Colleges Which Served as First Enrollment Choices

Kent Campus	12
University of Akron	7
Youngstown State University	6
Stark Technical College	4
Bowling Green State University	3
Walsh College	3
Cleveland State University	2
Cuyahoga Community College	2
Malone College	2
Ursuline College	2

Why These Other Colleges Were Chosen

Close to Home	8
Programs Offered	5
Courses Offered	3
Parents Attended There	3
Less Expensive	2
Personal Attention	2
Quality of Academic Programs	2

Colleges To Which Respondents Have Transferred

Kent Campus	19
Youngstown State University	11
Stark Technical College	7
University of Akron	5
Lakeland Community College	4
Malone College	4

Reasons Why Respondents Did Not Return to a Regional Campus

Availability of Courses	22
Job Responsibilities	16
Could Not Afford to Continue	11
Illness in the Family	7
Pregnancy	6
Personal Illness	5
Transient Student Not Planning to Re-Enroll	5
Family Responsibilities	4
Self or Spouse Activated for Military Service	4
Bad Experience at the Campus	3
Could Not Obtain Financial Aid	3
Other Colleges Less Expensive	3
Poor Quality of Teaching	3
On-Site Program Discontinued	2
Personal	2
Unsure of Academic Goals	2
Wedding	2

TABLE 1
AGES OF RESPONDENTS

AGE RANGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
18-21	37	19%	37	19%
22-25	29	15%	66	34%
26-30	28	14%	94	48%
31-40	62	32%	156	80%
41-50	33	17%	189	97%
51-60	6	3%	195	100%
Over 60	0	0%	195	100%

TABLE 2
CAMPUS ATTENDED BY RESPONDENTS

CAMPUS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
Ashtabula	29	15%	29	15%
East Liv.	6	3%	35	18%
Geauga	23	12%	58	30%
Salem	21	11%	79	41%
Stark	53	27%	132	68%
Trumbull	35	18%	167	86%
Tuscarawas	27	14%	194	100%

TABLE 3
ATTENDANCE DURATION OF RESPONDENTS

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
One Semester	70	36%	70	36%
One Year	46	24%	116	60%
Two Years	28	14%	144	74%
Three Years	29	15%	173	89%
Four or More Years	21	11%	194	100%

TABLE 4

SELF-REPORTED CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF RESPONDENTS

GPA	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
3.00-4.00	102	52%	102	52%
2.00-3.00	64	33%	166	85%
1.00-2.00	10	5%	176	90%
Below 1.00	2	1%	178	91%
Not Sure	16	9%	194	100%

TABLE 5
REASON FOR LEAVING BY CAMPUS
MEAN RATINGS

REASON	ASH	EL	GEA	SAL	STA	TRU	TUS	OVERALL
ACHGOAL	1.70	1.17	1.9	2.10	2.07	1.89	1.74	1.90
TRANSFER	2.11	1.00	1.42	1.52	1.96	1.61	1.37	1.69
BREAK	1.67	2.67	2.17	1.38	1.81	2.50	1.81	1.94
CRSNA	2.36	2.33	1.88	1.76	2.39	2.25	1.67	2.13
PROGNA	1.70	2.33	1.79	1.57	2.34	1.56	1.44	1.83
SCHED	2.41	1.50	1.96	1.86	1.98	2.14	2.07	2.05
DISPERF	1.67	1.83	1.25	1.48	1.68	1.67	1.59	1.59
DISTEACH	1.78	1.50	1.38	1.43	1.66	1.72	1.56	1.61
UNSURE	1.37	1.00	1.57	1.67	1.79	1.67	1.59	1.62
MONEY	2.10	2.50	2.29	2.05	2.26	2.14	2.19	2.19
FINAID	1.71	1.83	2.13	1.48	1.91	1.92	1.63	1.82
COSTBEN	1.22	1.00	1.21	1.14	1.23	1.19	1.11	1.19
JOB	1.33	1.00	1.67	1.67	1.36	2.00	1.48	1.55
MOVED	1.04	1.00	1.33	1.19	1.26	1.25	1.30	1.23
WORKSCH	1.79	1.83	2.63	1.79	1.94	2.56	1.93	2.09
FAMILY	1.82	2.00	2.08	2.10	1.72	2.54	2.26	2.05
PERS	2.07	1.50	2.04	2.29	2.10	2.29	2.48	2.18
CHILDCA	1.50	1.00	1.13	1.10	1.26	1.54	1.19	1.29
TRANSP	1.19	1.00	1.17	1.05	1.04	1.11	1.07	1.09

1 = NOT A REASON 5 = VERY IMPORTANT REASON

TABLE 6

**ACADEMIC ADVISING
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	20.0%	50.0%	28.6%	13.3%	11.6%	6.7%	13.6%
High	25.0%	25.0%		40.0%	32.6%	36.7%	31.8%
Moderate	20.0%		42.9%	26.7%	27.8%	43.2%	41.0%
Low	15.0%	25.0%	14.3%	20.0%	14.0%	6.7%	9.1%
Very Low	20.0%		14.2%		14.0%	6.7%	4.5%

TABLE 7
**ADMISSIONS
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	14.3%	40.0%	45.5%	28.6%	13.0%	11.4%	28.0%
High	32.1%	40.0%	22.7%	52.4%	44.4%	48.6%	32.0%
Moderate	46.4%	20.0%	27.3%	14.3%	31.5%	40.0%	32.0%
Low	3.6%			4.7%	7.4%		4.0%
Very Low	3.6%		4.5%		3.7%		4.0%

TABLE 8
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	21.8%		64.4%	13.3%	13.3%	18.2%	30.4%
High	52.2%	40.0%	7.1%	53.3%	55.6%	42.4%	43.5%
Moderate	21.7%	60.0%	21.4%	20.0%	31.1%	36.4%	26.1%
Low	4.3%		7.1%	6.7%		3.0%	
Very Low				6.7%			

TABLE 9

**CAREER PLACEMENT
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High			50.0%				42.9%
High	33.3%		50.0%	25.0%	22.2%	20.0%	14.3%
Moderate	33.3%			50.0%	66.7%	60.0%	42.8%
Low	33.3%			25.0%			
Very Low					11.1%	20.0%	

TABLE 10

**CAREER PLANNING
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High		100.0%	16.7%				20.0%
High	14.3%		16.7%	50.0%	21.5%	14.3%	40.0%
Moderate	42.9%		16.7%	50.0%	35.7%	42.9%	20.0%
Low	14.3%		33.2%		7.1%	21.4%	10.0%
Very Low	28.5%		16.7%		35.7%	21.4%	10.0%

TABLE 11

**COMPUTER LABORATORIES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	37.5%	100.0%	25.0%	25.0%		4.6%	33.3%
High	31.3%		50.0%	58.4%	29.4%	27.3%	38.9%
Moderate	25.0%		25.0%	8.3%	58.8%	63.6%	22.2%
Low				8.3%	5.9%	4.5%	5.6%
Very Low	6.2%				5.9%		

TABLE 12
FACULTY ATTITUDE
TOWARD STUDENTS
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	16.7%	16.7%	44.4%	23.8%	15.7%	22.6%	32.0%
High	50.0%	50.0%	38.9%	52.4%	47.1%	35.5%	32.0%
Moderate	20.8%	33.3%	16.7%	23.8%	21.6%	38.7%	24.0%
Low	12.5%				9.8%	3.2%	8.0%
Very Low					5.8%		4.0%

TABLE 13
FINANCIAL AID
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	33.3%	50.0%	28.6%	33.3%	11.6%	25.0%	37.5%
High	33.3%	25.0%		25.0%	42.3%	31.3%	18.8%
Moderate	22.3%	25.0%	28.6	16.7%	34.6%	12.5%	25.0%
Low	11.1%		28.6%	16.7%	3.8%	18.8%	6.3%
Very Low			14.2%	8.3%	7.7%	12.4%	12.4%

TABLE 14
FOOD SERVICE
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	10.0%		6.7%		13.6%	6.3%	18.2%
High	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	25.0%	32.4%	56.3%	9.1%
Moderate	65.0%	20.0%	46.6%	45.0%	48.6%	31.1%	59.1%
Low	5.0%	20.0%	20.0%	15.0%	5.4%	6.3%	9.1%
Very Low		20.0%	6.7%	15.0%			4.5%

TABLE 15

**LIBRARY SERVICES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	30.5%	40.0%	25.0%	5.9%	21.9%	11.2%	30.4%
High	39.1%	60.0%	12.5%	64.7%	28.1%	37.0%	30.4%
Moderate	26.1%		62.5%	17.6%	34.4%	44.4%	26.2%
Low				11.8%	15.6%	7.4%	8.7%
Very Low	4.3%						4.3%

TABLE 16
MINORITY STUDENTS SERVICES
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High			66.7%				14.2%
High				20.0%	12.5%	22.2%	28.6%
Moderate	100.0%			40.0%	87.5%	55.6%	28.6%
Low				20.0%		11.1%	28.6%
Very Low			33.3%	20.0%		11.1%	

TABLE 17

**PARKING
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	33.4%		55.6%	5.0%	16.7%	20.0%	28.0%
High	20.8%	16.7%	27.8%	30.0%	31.3%	25.7%	16.0%
Moderate	37.5%		16.6%	30.0%	41.7%	40.0%	32.0%
Low	8.3%	33.3%		25.0%	8.3%	5.7%	16.0%
Very Low		50.0%		10.0%	2.0%	8.6%	8.0%

TABLE 18
PERSONAL COUNSELING
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	10.0%	50.0%	28.6%		14.3%	7.1%	22.2%
High	20.0%		42.8%	75.0%	33.3%	21.4%	11.2%
Moderate	30.0%		28.6%	25.0%	23.8%	43.0%	44.4%
Low	10.0%	50.0%			14.3%	21.4%	22.2%
Very Low	30.0%				14.3%	7.1%	

TABLE 19

**QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION
IN ALL COURSES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	26.1%	33.3%	33.3%	20.0%	17.8%	3.2%	21.7%
High	34.8%	33.4%	50.0%	35.0%	42.2%	45.2%	47.9%
Moderate	34.8%	33.3%	16.7%	40.0%	28.9%	51.6%	21.7%
Low	4.3%			5.0%	8.9%		
Very Low					2.2%		8.7%

TABLE 20
QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION
IN LER COURSES
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	26.7%	40.0%	27.3%		17.9%	9.1%	21.4%
High	40.0%	40.0%	36.3%	40.0%	33.3%	45.5%	21.4%
Moderate	33.3%	20.0%	36.4%	60.0%	38.5%	40.9%	50.0%
Low					2.6%	4.5%	
Very Low					7.7%		7.2%

58

59

TABLE 21

**QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION
IN MAJOR COURSES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	30.5%	40.0%	25.0%	25.0%	15.8%	27.6%	25.0%
High	39.1%	40.0%	41.6%	25.0%	47.4%	27.6%	25.0%
Moderate	13.0%		16.7%	40.0%	28.9%	24.2%	37.5%
Low				10.0%	7.9%	17.2%	8.3%
Very Low	17.4%	20.0%	16.7%			3.4%	4.2%

TABLE 22

**REGIONAL CAMPUSES'
CONCERN FOR STUDENTS AS PEOPLE
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	17.7%	33.3%	37.5%	17.6%	7.0%	17.2%	23.8%
High	23.5%	16.7%	18.8%	35.4%	20.8%	27.6%	28.6%
Moderate	23.5%	50.0%	43.7%	29.4%	60.5%	48.3%	33.3%
Low	29.4%			17.6%	4.7%		14.3%
Very Low	5.9%				7.0%	6.9%	

TABLE 23
REGISTRATION
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	11.5%	33.3%	55.0%	31.6%	9.7%	13.9%	26.0%
High	34.6%	50.0%	25.0%	42.1%	38.5%	47.2%	33.3%
Moderate	46.2%	16.7%	15.0%	10.5%	36.5%	36.1%	14.8%
Low			5.0%	10.5%	11.5%	2.8%	18.5%
Very Low	7.7%			5.3%	3.8%		7.4%

TABLE 24
SKILLS/TUTORING CENTER
BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High		50.0%	33.3%	20.0%	12.5%	14.3%	30.8%
High	20.0%	50.0%	33.4%	50.0%	43.8%	23.8%	23.1%
Moderate	20.0%		33.3%	20.0%	31.1%	47.6%	30.7%
Low	40.0%			10.0%	6.3%	9.5%	7.7%
Very Low	20.0%				6.3%	4.8%	7.7%

67

TABLE 25

**STUDENT ACTIVITIES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	14.3%		37.5%		14.4%	10.0%	10.0%
High	28.6%	100.0%	25.0%	66.7%	21.4%	20.0%	30.0%
Moderate	57.1%		37.5%	16.6%	50.0%	40.0%	40.0%
Low				16.7%	7.1%	20.0%	20.0%
Very Low					7.1%	10.0%	

TABLE 26

**STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF
ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	11.1%	100.0%	54.5%				16.7%
High	44.5%		27.3%	50.0%	25.9%	42.1%	33.3%
Moderate	33.3%		18.2%	50.0%	63.0%	36.8%	50.0%
Low	11.1%				3.7%	5.3%	
Very Low					7.4%	15.8%	

TABLE 27

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT BY CAMPUS

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	16.7%		33.3%		15.4%	14.3%	16.7%
High	16.6%			20.0%	7.7%	14.3%	33.3%
Moderate	66.7%		33.4%	20.0%	76.9%	57.1%	50.0%
Low			33.3%			14.3%	
Very Low				60.0%			

TABLE 28
**VETERANS SERVICES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High			50.0%				12.5%
High	33.3%		25.0%	33.3%	36.4%	25.0%	12.5%
Moderate	66.7%		25.0%		54.5%	50.0%	50.0%
Low					9.1%	25.0%	12.5%
Very Low				66.7%			12.5%

TABLE 29

**GENERAL SATISFACTION
WITH THE KSU REGIONAL CAMPUSES
BY CAMPUS**

Rating	Ashtabula	EL	Geauga	Salem	Stark	Trumbull	Tusc
Very High	10.8%		50.0%	23.9%	17.3%	9.4%	41.7%
High	50.0%	66.7%	22.2%	47.6%	46.2%	50.0%	20.8%
Moderate	32.1%	33.3%	27.8%	19.0%	30.8%	37.5%	33.3%
Low	7.1%			9.5%	1.9%	3.1%	4.2%
Very Low					3.8%		

TABLE 30

MEAN SATISFACTION RATINGS FOR CAMPUS SERVICES BY CAMPUS

SERVICE	ASH	EL	GEA	SAL	STA	TRU	TUS	OVERALL
ADMISS	3.50	4.20	4.05	4.05	3.56	3.71	3.76	3.73
FINAID	3.89	4.25	3.00	3.58	3.46	3.38	3.63	3.53
SKILLCEN	2.40	2.50	4.00	3.80	3.50	3.33	3.62	3.53
REGISTER	3.42	3.17	4.30	3.84	3.39	3.72	3.52	3.65
ADVISING	3.10	4.00	3.14	3.47	3.14	3.30	3.41	3.27
MINSERV	3.00		3.67	2.60	3.13	2.89	3.629	3.06
CARPLAN	2.43	5.00	2.83	3.50	2.43	2.50	3.50	2.85
CARPLAC	3.00		4.50	3.00	3.00	2.80	4.00	3.23
PARKING	3.79	1.83	4.39	2.95	3.52	3.43	3.40	3.49
PERSCOU	2.70	3.50	4.00	3.75	3.19	3.00	3.33	3.25
STUDACT	3.57	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.29	3.00	3.30	3.41
LIBRARY	3.91	4.40	3.63	3.65	3.56	3.52	3.74	3.69
VETERAN	3.18	3.33	4.25	2.00	3.27	3.00	3.00	3.18
COMLAB	3.94	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.12	3.32	4.00	3.72
BUILDGR	3.91	3.40	4.29	3.60	3.82	2.76	4.04	3.86
STUDEMP	3.50		3.33	2.00	3.39	3.29	3.67	3.26
FOOD	3.35	2.80	3.00	2.80	3.54	3.63	3.27	3.32
INSTALL	3.83	4.00	4.17	3.70	3.64	3.52	3.74	3.73
INSTLER	3.93	4.20	3.91	3.40	3.51	3.59	3.50	3.63
INSTMAJ	3.65	3.80	3.58	3.65	3.71	3.59	3.59	3.64
FACATT	3.70	3.83	4.28	4.00	3.57	3.77	3.80	3.79
SAATT	3.56	5.00	4.36	3.50	3.07	3.05	3.67	3.43
RCCONC	3.18	3.83	3.94	3.53	3.16	3.48	3.62	3.44
SATISFAC	3.64	3.67	4.22	3.86	3.71	3.66	4.00	3.80

1 = Very Low 5 = Very High

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary

The spring 1991 Non-Returning Student Survey represented an attempt to better understand the nature of student leaving and what may constitute positive as well as negative "attrition." The specific goals of the survey were 1) to describe the characteristics of students who did not continue their enrollment, 2) to learn the reasons why students did not continue, and 3) to gather the perceptions of academic and student services by students who did not re-enroll.

The survey sample consisted of one-half of the 2,392 (1,196) students who were enrolled during the fall semester of 1990 but who did not return for the spring semester of 1991. A 20% final response rate was obtained. The respondents were generally representative of all Regional Campuses students with respect to gender, ethnicity, age, full-time/part-time status, and campus attended.

The three objectives of the survey and the results are as follows:

1. To gain information concerning the characteristics of Regional Campuses students who did not re-enroll

They shared many of the same characteristics as past and current Regional Campuses students (Regional Campuses Alumni Survey, 1990; Regional Campuses New Freshmen Survey, 1990); 76% of the respondents were female; nearly all identified themselves as Caucasian; there was a wide age distribution of respondents and the largest number were in the 31-40 age range. The percentages of respondents attending each campus generally reflected the percentages of all students attending each campus, although East Liverpool was under-represented and Geauga was over-represented. This should be remembered when interpreting the survey results.

Sixty percent of the respondents had been enrolled one semester or one year. More than one-half of the respondents reported their grade point averages as between 3.00 and 4.00. Over 80% of the respondents were employed. The Kent State University Regional Campuses were the first enrollment choice of 73% of the respondents.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were enrolled primarily part-time, in contrast to about 54% of all students enrolled part-time. Forty-three percent of the respondents were working towards a baccalaureate degree while enrolled and 39% toward an associate degree. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were freshmen or sophomores. Forty-nine percent of the respondents have taken one or more developmental education courses.

Most of the respondents reported 1) completing courses for transfer to the Kent Campus or to another educational institution, completing some courses to increase their knowledge and understanding in an academic field, or obtaining an associate degree as their most important academic goals, 2) improving knowledge, technical skills, and competencies in a current career or preparing for a new career as their most important career goals, 3) meeting people as their most important social goal, and 4) developing the ability to be independent, self-reliant, and adaptable as their most important personal development goal.

Forty-seven percent of the respondents say they will return to the Regional Campuses at an unspecified time and 41% say they have or will transfer to another institution.

2. To ascertain some of the reasons why students did not continue their enrollment

The reasons most frequently rated as important for not returning from a list of 19 potential reasons included, in rank order, desired courses not being available, personal reasons, family responsibilities, not having enough money to continue, not being able to work and attend college simultaneously, classes being scheduled at the wrong times, achieving academic goals, needing a break from college, not being able to obtain financial aid, desired programs not available, transferring to another institution, accepting a job, respondents dissatisfaction with their academic performance, and dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching.

The most frequent reasons for leaving gathered from the open-ended responses were, in rank order, the availability of courses, accepting a job, and not being able to afford to continue. A more critical reading of the availability of courses response revealed respondents were actually addressing three issues; 1) they had completed the courses required for an associate degree, but would graduate in a subsequent semester, 2) they desired upper division courses not available at their campus, and 3) they desired courses not offered by the campuses.

Although students who had relocated to the Kent Campus were removed from the survey sample, Kent was still listed as the most frequent college to which respondents had transferred. This suggests these students intend to enroll at Kent, but did not do so for the Spring 1991 Semester.

3. To learn respondents' opinions regarding the academic and student services provided

The respondents rated from very high to very low their agreement with a number of statements concerning the image of the Regional Campuses and their satisfaction with each of the 24 academic and student services listed. Most of the responses were in the high, very high, and moderate categories. Veterans' Services and Minority Student Services were rated least favorably, although the large percentage of non-response to these items makes the results suspect. Career Planning and Career Placement also tended to be rated least favorably. This is consistent with the results of the Regional Campuses Alumni Survey (1990) and the Regional Campuses New Freshmen Survey (1990) and with another community college non-returning student survey (Johnson County Community College, 1990).

B. Conclusions

Tinto (1987) notes two forms of student departure from college: academic dismissal and voluntary withdrawal. Voluntary withdrawal results from such student and institutional factors as intentions, commitment, adjustment, difficulty, congruence, and isolation. He cites student academic and social integration as the most important correlates of student persistence and notes that such seemingly critical factors as finance are often themselves not paramount in student leaving. He acknowledges two-year college student enrollment is especially prone to the influence of external communities (such as job and family responsibilities). These influences, manifested in such factors as course availability and scheduling, are important in student withdrawal.

The survey attempted to examine the impact of these influences on students who did not re-enroll at the Regional Campuses. Only 4.7% of the population did not return due to academic dismissal and 10% had relocated to Kent; thus over 85% withdrew voluntarily. While some of the results were difficult to explain (not being able to afford to continue being rated as far less of a factor at Salem than at the other campuses), some were surprising (twice as many women as men said lack of financial aid was a major factor), and some (such as finance and personal reasons) may represent socially acceptable attributions instead of true withdrawal factors, many of Tinto's ideas about student departure hold up.

Nearly 10% of the sample had relocated to the Kent Campus and transfer to another college was a major factor. Family and career responsibilities and achieving academic goals were also often cited. Many of these can be considered either positive outcomes or issues over which the University has no direct impact. Many of the students who could not work and attend college at the same time said they plan to return. Lack of financial resources was a major factor most commonly among those who also had lower grade point averages, suggesting leaving be attributed to lack of money rather than to the true cause of academic difficulties. These results were similar to those of another community college survey of non-returning students (Johnson County Community College, 1990).

It must be remembered that more than 75% of the respondents said they wanted to enroll for only a limited number of courses for transfer or increased knowledge or were unsure of their academic goals. Forty-seven percent of the respondents said they will return to the Regional Campuses and an additional 30% were unsure and may return. These facts should help to provide a more sophisticated, realistic, and positive view of Regional Campuses student enrollment behaviors.

IV. REFERENCES

- Johnson County Community College. Office of Institutional Research. (1990). Non-returning student study. Overland Park, KS: Author.
- Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services. (1990). Regional Campuses alumni survey of 1987, 1988, and 1989 associate degree recipients. Kent, OH: Author.
- Kent State University. Regional Campuses. Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation Services. (1990). Regional Campuses new freshmen survey. Kent, OH: Author.
- Tinto, Vincent. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX: The Survey

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the directions at the bottom of the answer sheet and fill in the correct circle on your answer sheet for each question. It is not necessary to give your name or ID number on the computer or supplemental answer sheets.

1. What is your gender?
 - A. Female
 - B. Male
2. How do you describe yourself?
 - A. Native American/American Indian
 - B. Asian American
 - C. African American/Black
 - D. Hispanic American
 - E. Caucasian/White
 - F. Other
3. How old are you?
 - A. 18 to 21 years
 - B. 22 to 25 years
 - C. 26 to 30 years
 - D. 31 to 40 years
 - E. 41 to 50 years
 - F. 51 to 60 years
 - G. 61 years or more
4. Which Regional Campus did you attend? (If you were attending more than one at the same time, please indicate the campus you attended for the most credit hours.)
 - A. Ashtabula
 - B. East Liverpool
 - C. Geauga
 - D. Salem
 - E. Stark
 - F. Trumbull
 - G. Tuscarawas
5. How long did you attend a Regional Campus?
 - A. One Semester
 - B. One Year
 - C. Two Years
 - D. Three Years
 - E. Four or More Years
6. What was your overall grade point average (GPA)?
 - A. Less Than 1.00
 - B. 1.00 to 1.99
 - C. 2.00 to 2.99
 - D. 3.00 to 4.00
 - E. Not Sure

7. How would you describe your employment status when you last attended a Regional Campus?
- A. Unemployed, seeking employment
 - B. Unemployed by my own choice or due to family responsibilities
 - C. Employed fewer than 20 hours per week
 - D. Employed 20 to 39 hours per week
 - E. Employed 40 hours per week
 - F. Employed more than 40 hours per week
8. Were the KSU Regional Campuses your first choice when you considered colleges in which to enroll?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
9. Were you most frequently enrolled full-time (12 or more credit hours per semester) or part-time (1 to 11 credit hour per semester) when you attended a Regional Campus?
- A. Full-Time
 - B. Part-time
10. What degree were you working toward at the Regional Campus?
(Please give your best estimate if you were undecided.)
- A. Not seeking a degree/seeking a certificate
 - B. Associate degree
 - C. Bachelors degree
 - D. Graduate degree
 - E. Re-certification
11. What was your class level when you last attended a Regional Campus?
- A. Freshman
 - B. Sophomore
 - C. Junior
 - D. Senior
 - E. Non-Degree
 - F. Graduate
12. Which was your most important academic goal when you attended?
- A. To complete some courses to increase my knowledge and understanding in an academic field
 - B. To obtain an Associate Degree
 - C. To complete courses to transfer to the Kent Campus or another educational institution
 - D. Other or not sure

13. Which was your most important **career preparation goal** when you last attended?
- A. To explore career interests
 - B. To prepare for a new career
 - C. To improve my knowledge, technical skills, and/or competencies for my job or career
 - D. To increase my chances for a raise and/or a promotion
 - E. Other or not sure
14. Which was your most important **social/cultural participation goal** when you last attended?
- A. To become actively involved in student life and campus activities
 - B. To meet people
 - C. To get to know people who think and feel differently than I do
 - D. Other or not sure
 - E. No social goal in mind
15. Which was your most important **personal development and enrichment goal** when you last attended?
- A. To increase my self-confidence
 - B. To improve my leadership skills
 - C. To improve my ability to get along with others
 - D. To learn skills that will improve my daily life or make me a more complete person
 - E. To develop my ability to be independent, self-reliant, and adaptable
 - F. No personal development goal in mind
16. Do you plan to return to college?
- A. No, not at this time
 - B. Yes, I plan to re-enroll at a Regional Campus
 - C. Yes, I plan enroll at another college
 - D. Yes, I have enrolled at another college
 - D. I am unsure at this time
17. How many developmental education courses did you complete?
- A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two
 - D. Three or more

Please rate the importance of each of the following reasons for your decision not to return to a Regional Campus using the following scale:

A	Not at all a reason	D	An important reason				
B	A very minor reason	E	A very important reason				
C	Somewhat of a reason or unsure						
18.	Achieved my academic goals		A	B	C	D	E
19.	Transferred to another college		A	B	C	D	E
20.	Needed a break from college		A	B	C	D	E
21.	Courses I wanted were not available		A	B	C	D	E
22.	Programs I wanted were not available		A	B	C	D	E
23.	Classes were scheduled at the wrong times		A	B	C	D	E
24.	Dissatisfied with my academic performance		A	B	C	D	E
25.	Dissatisfied with the quality of teaching		A	B	C	D	E
26.	Unsure of my academic goals		A	B	C	D	E
27.	Did not have enough money to continue		A	B	C	D	E
28.	Could not obtain sufficient financial aid		A	B	C	D	E
29.	College benefits not worth the cost		A	B	C	D	E
30.	Accepted a job		A	B	C	D	E
31.	Moved out of the area		A	B	C	D	E
32.	Could not work and go to school at the same time		A	B	C	D	E
33.	Family responsibilities were too great		A	B	C	D	E
34.	Personal reasons		A	B	C	D	E
35.	Child care not available		A	B	C	D	E
36.	Public transportation not available		A	B	C	D	E

The following are services provided by the KSU Regional Campuses. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the treatment you received from the services listed below. Please do not rate services you did not use and use the following scale:

A	Very Low	D	High						
B	Low	E	Very High						
C	Moderate								
37.	Admissions	A	B	C	D	E			
38.	Financial Aid	A	B	C	D	E			
39.	Academic Skills/ Tutoring Center	A	B	C	D	E			
40.	Registration	A	B	C	D	E			
41.	Academic Advising	A	B	C	D	E			
42.	Minority Student Services	A	B	C	D	E			
43.	Career Planning	A	B	C	D	E			
44.	Career Placement	A	B	C	D	E			
45.	Parking	A	B	C	D	E			
46.	Personal Counseling	A	B	C	D	E			
47.	Student Activities/ Student Life	A	B	C	D	E			
48.	Library Services	A	B	C	D	E			
49.	Veterans Services	A	B	C	D	E			
50.	Computer Laboratories	A	B	C	D	E			
51.	Buildings and Grounds	A	B	C	D	E			
52.	Student Employment	A	B	C	D	E			

A	Very Low	D	High
B	Low	E	Very High
C	Moderate		

53.	Food Service/Vending	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Quality of Instruction in your Major	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Quality of Instruction in Liberal Education Requirement (LER) Courses	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Overall Quality of Instruction in All Courses	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Attitude of Faculty Towards Students	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Attitude of Student Affairs Staff Towards Students	A	B	C	D	E
59.	The Campuses' Concern for You as a Person	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Your Overall Satisfaction with the KSU Regional Campuses	A	B	C	D	E

Please remember to also complete the Supplemental Answer Sheet. Thank you.

SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER SHEET

61. What was your major? _____
62. What other college was your first choice if you answered "no" to Question 8?

63. Why was this college your first choice if you answered "no" to Question 8?

64. If you transferred to another college, which one?

Please use the space below for any additional comments that you have about why you did not re-enroll at a Regional Campus.